DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 955 SP 018 754

AUTHOR Ginsberg, Rick; Melnick, Curtis C.
TITLE Report of Summer, 1980 Workshop. Roosevelt University/Chicago Board of Education Teacher Corps Project.
INSTITUTION Chicago Board of Education, Ill.; Roosevelt Univ., Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 49p.; For related documents, see SP 018 757-758.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *Educational Environment; Inservice Teacher Education; Mainstreaming; *Problem Solving; Program Development; Program Evaluation; School Community Relationship; *Summative Evaluation; *Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

An overview is presented of the planning, activities and evaluation of a Teacher Corps summer workshop held in Chicago in 1981. Participants in the fifteen-day workshop were faculty and administrators from the Hyde Park Career Academy and Dumas Elementary School, community council members, and Teacher Corps interns. The purposes of the workshop were to provide an opportunity for participants to work together on the identification and solution of school-related problems, and to produce plans of action to guide the collaborative efforts of Teacher Corps staff and school and community persons to reach the overall school improvement goals of the Teacher Corps. Participants gave high ratings to the small-group, task-oriented approach. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED207955

Report of

Summer, 1980 Workshop

Rick Ginsberg
Curtis C. Melnick
Roosevelt University/Chicago Board of Education
Teacher Corps Project

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CURTIS C. MELNICK

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Summer, 1981

SP 018 754

Foreword

One of the most valuable personnel development activities created by the Roosevelt University-Chicago Board of Education Teacher Corps Project' 78 has been the intensive and extensive summer workshop for participants from all facets of the Project.

This is an account of the rationale, planning, summary of activities, and evaluation of the Summer 1980 Workshop. It had carefully planned goals capable of realization and a varied format of both small group and large group activities.

Best of all the workshop was timely in that it dealt with the real problems of the schools in which the Project works--Hyde Park Career Academy, the Dumas Elementary School and the Dumas Child-Parent Center.

As can be seen from the evaluations given to each workshop activity and from the summative evaluation, it was a major contribution to the development and learning of its participants.

Not only did it accomplish several goals at the completion of the workshop, but it also set the tone and scope for further personnel development activities throughout the entire academic year, 1980-81.

Curtis C. Melnick,
Director

Roosevelt University
430 S. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60605

Summer, 1981

Table of Contents

Foreword

Introduction 1

Planning 3

The Workshop 8

Week I 8

Week II 11

Week III 12

Evaluation 16

Summative Evaluation 22

Conclusions 28

Epilog 30

Appendix A 31

Appendix B 34

Summer Workshop - 1980

Introduction

The Roosevelt University Chicago Board of Education Teacher Corps Project, has been in operation since 1978. During these years, the project has addressed several goals. They include:

- -Enhancing school climate
- -Implementing professional development programs for in-service and pre-service education
- -Institutionalizing of educational objectives after federal funding ceases
- -Disseminating and demonstrating the improvements made by the Project to other agencies and institutions
- -Articulating feeder schools of Hyde Park Academy, especially the Dumas Elementary School, with the Academy
- -Enhancing career education at both the high school and elementary school levels.

The project consists of participants from an institution of higher education (IHE)--Roosevelt University including student teacher interns; from a local education agency (LEA)--staff from Hyde Park Career Academy, Dumas Elementary School and the Dumas Child-Parent Center, all from the Chicago public school system; and from an elected Community Council. Individuals from these groups, including teachers, administrators, parents, interns and university personnel, worked collectively to accomplish the prementioned goals.

This document will describe the second annual summer workshop, an activity which has emerged as the project's most valuable training function. The summer workshop provided 45 hours of concentrated activity during the summer school hiatus. It has provided a vehicle for discussion and plans for action for almost all phases of the high school, elementary school, child-parent center and Community Council with which participants have been concerned. The summer workshop has provided a forum for interchange of ideas among the various groups, and also has been the primary source for developing plans for other ongoing Project Programs and practices. These include: cadres--two groups, one consisting of

high school teachers, administrators, IHE personnel, interns, team leader and Community Council persons; the other made up of elementary school teachers and administrators, child-parent center personnel, IHE personnel, interns, team leader and Community Council persons. Both cadres meet bi-monthly to address project specified goals as outlined, and to meet site specific circumstances as the need arises.

- Community Council--a group of concerned parents of the schools' community elected in October of 1978. The 11 member Community Council meets monthly to address project goals, specifically those that have direct impact on parents and the community.

- Parent Volunteers Program--a new activity begun at the high school following this year's summer workshop, as a joint venture of the Community Council and high school staff to assist bringing parent volunteers into the school and assigning them to important tasks within the school's program.

- Other--the project has sponsored a number of in-service activities for teachers and parents, and the birth of these workshops takes form during the summer sessions. Workshops have thus been held in the areas of multicultural education, improvement of parenting, articulation between schools, to name a few.

The advantages of the summer workshop are summarized as follows:

·during the summer, teachers are not burdened with the pressure of day to day classroom and other activities. Teachers welcome the opportunity to earn a reasonable stipend which attendance at the workshop supplies.

·a three hour training period each day for fifteen consecutive workdays enables participants to quickly build in the results of daily deliberations without the necessity for taking time for lengthy reviews, as occurs when workshops are conducted on a spasmodic basis.

·the workshop is an opportunity to attract to Teacher Corps members of the

faculties of schools in which the program operates who had not previously participated to any great degree in Project activities. It also allows for continued and ongoing contact for those participants who had been active in activities throughout the year.

·the workshop provides a convenient format for bringing together the staffs of all the schools with Community Council and IHE personnel, and provides for articulation of ideas and needs among the various groups.

·the lengthy period of training allows for total group interaction to address specified Teacher Corps goals, and also permits small intragroup work on areas germane to each particular setting.

Generally stated, the goals for the 1980 workshop were:

1) To provide an opportunity for interested faculty, administrators, community members and interns of the involved schools to meet and work together on the identification of school related problems and the design of strategies to solve them.

2) To produce plans of action and strategies for implementing the plans which would guide the collaborative efforts of Teacher Corps staff and school and community persons in satisfaction of the overall goals of the Teacher Corps Project.

Planning

Initial suggestions for summer workshop program topics were solicited from the two Cadres. The format for the summer conference was somewhat settled, as a result of the projects staff's experience with two successful summer workshops during the operation of a Cycle 11 Teacher Corps Project in 1976 and 1977, as well as this Project's first summer workship in 1979. Following the 1979 workshop, certain format alterations were suggested by participants, and these, as well as any reasonable new suggestions, were considered in the final design of

the 1980 program. The cadres, in meetings during April, May and June, came up with the following possible topics:

Hyde Park Cadre--the high school's image to feeder schools; freshman orientation program for students and parents; more community involvement in the school; better implementation process involving the school administration for plans drawn up at the summer workshop; small group work with feedback sessions to the entire group in continuous progress, discipline, articulation with Dumas; allowing a new assistant principal to explain his proposed methods and procedures; having combined social affairs for feeder and secondary schools; identifying skills lacking in elementary school graduates when they come to high school; discussing parental input into the faculty newsletter.

Dumas Cadre--having perception training sessions so teachers at different levels can better appreciate others' problems; completing resource center cataloging and filing for Dumas center; visiting the Center of Urban Education to pick up more materials and ideas for the resource center; planning of career education fairs including possible themes and format; setting goals and objectives for curricula in mathematics and reading; working on student problems in upper levels in relation to adjustment to high school; preparing workshop on conference ideas for multicultural education activities; and, having teachers present models of teaching ideas learned at a regional Teacher Corps Conference.

Members from each Cadre, as well as Community Council and Roosevelt personnel, formed a planning committee to finalize plans for the summer workshop. Three meetings were held in June and early July at sites in the field to settle the agenda and format. It was the general consensus of all planning committee members that the summer workshop be run organizationally as it had been the previous summer. This meant that agenda be prepared for each day; clear work expectations be set for both large and small group activities; a calendar

of activities be drawn up and strictly followed; and, coffee and tea be provided each morning.

In addition, several suggestions were offered:

·provide for better means of implementing the plans which evolve from the workshop particularly concerning communication with the administration. Follow-up would be required prior to the beginning of the academic year and some periodic reaffirmation of intention and activities would be necessary throughout the year.

·attention should be given to making large group sessions less boring and more relevant to workshop goals.

Also at these meetings, a list of possible topics for inclusion in the workshop was generated. Certain of these topics received total support, while others were not overwhelmingly supported by the group, as certain topics only had site specific relevance. The list included:

·improvement of articulation between the schools, by having an outside consultant explore perceptions of teachers with the goal of dispelling myths and incorrect notions about teachers at other schools. The final outcome would be to increase knowledge of all teachers concerning what is taught, how it is taught and why it is taught at other educational levels and creating a more continuous and consistent approach to the K-12 educational program.

·an overview of last year's conference with specific attention to those aspects not yet accomplished.

·a series of sessions on special education by an outside expert, on the present and future status of mainstreaming and PL 94-142 to assist teachers in methods of early detection of learning problems.

·giving interns and Community Council one entire session to discuss their work. The interns would speak on their community projects, while the Council

would address accomplishments and future plans.

·a session on teacher stress. The purpose would be to identify causes and also to discuss effects on the stress of events such as budget cuts, Board of Education programs, peer problems, parent-teacher relationships, and the like.

·sessions on improving relationships between administration and teaching staffs and relationships between Cadres and administration.

·for Hyde Park teachers, the need to revise English and mathematics curricula.

·for Hyde Park teachers, the need to learn something about continuous progress at the elementary level, and how it may eventually be instituted at the secondary school level. A Board of Education consultant was suggested.

·two other suggestions for Hyde Park included student discipline procedures for next year, especially in light of the arrival of a new assistant principal in charge of discipline, and the area of parent involvement at the high school. Possible means for development in this latter area included an orientation for parents of incoming freshmen; joint parent activities with Dumas; more parent involvement in extra-curricular functions; and, the general need for more plans involving the community.

·more multicultural activity sessions.

·for Dumas, time should be set aside to plan career education functions.

·Dumas faculty specified the area of improving classroom climate as a session topic.

·more follow-up of Dumas graduates at the high school, in terms of orientation to the school, tracking of pupils, records, etc.--all areas related to better articulation between the schools.

From this rather exhaustive list of suggestions, a final set of topics and

calendar for the conference was prepared by the planning committee.* John Davis, Board of Education human relations expert, and Ken James, associate professor of special education at Northeastern Illinois University, were selected as consultants to give presentations to the conference. In addition, George Olson and Rick Ginsberg Roosevelt Teacher Corps staff personnel who are presently engaged in a major study of teacher stress in New York and Chicago, were designated to make the presentation on stress. The planning committee also devised and selected a number of worksheets to assist assignment of teachers to small groups, instruments and post-meeting-reaction sheets, forms for reporting of progress of work, and evaluation of the conference and its various components. (See Appendix B for copies of these instruments and worksheets.)

Thus, the 1980 summer workshop was planned for July 14 through August 1. Meetings were held from 9:00 AM until 12:00 Noon Monday through Friday, at Kenwood Academy, a centrally located field site with air conditioned facilities. A combination of large and small group sessions was planned, with small groups being the dominant format. Each participant would be involved in one small group task, and one mini-project. Large group sessions were to have greater variability in their structure, format and intended outcomes. Facilitators were assigned to assist all small groups. Participant evaluations frequently were to be used to indicate satisfaction levels and for making modifications in format or content.

*See Appendix A, "The Calendar"

The Workshop

The summer workshop began on Monday, July 14, and was completed on Friday, August 1. The 46 participants included 35 teachers (24 from the high school, including an assistant principal, and 11 from the elementary school), 4 Community Council persons, 3 teacher interns and 4 Project staff members. Principals of both schools made periodic appearances at the workshop, as did administrators from the central office of the Chicago Public Schools. Four resource consultants also participated. Daily agenda were prepared by the Project staff and coffee and rolls were provided each morning. Each small group activity concluded with a daily written summation of the progress and status of its work. Each attendee was given a package of materials including an explanatory letter outlining the workshop rationale and goals, a calendar of events, small group reporting forms, worksheets, and writing implements and paper.

WEEK ONE : July 14-18, 1980

The first day of the conference began with a brief talk by Curtis Melnick, Project Director, on the goals of the Teacher Corps Project, the arrangements and procedures for the workshop and an introduction of Project personnel. Dr. Melnick concluded his remarks with a perspective on the goals and intended outcomes of the Summer Workshop. Dr. Melnick was followed by human relations expert John Davis, whose presentation, "Perceptions check," was designed to get everyone to know each other better, and to break down inaccurate stereotypes of individuals who work in different settings. Each participant was given a set of questions on personal and moral matters and asked to answer the questions. Then he/she teamed with another participant and both shared each other's responses. Each team member informed the entire group about his/her team-

mate's personality as ascertained from the brief teaming period.

Consultant Davis next asked each of the participants to list positive and negative characteristics of all teachers, and then elementary teachers and high school teachers separately. Responses were collected and summarized to the entire group. Inaccurate and negative stereotypes were exposed and discussed. The day ended with all participants filling out selection forms for small mini-projects from a group of choices.

The second day began with a discussion of how to conduct role-playing sessions. Participants were assigned to small groups, each with a specified topic as designated on the selection forms. Group topics included parent involvement at Dumas, the Dumas Resource Center, revision of high school English and Mathematics curricula, ninth grade orientation program, a prospective booklet containing faculty biographies and revision of the high school's teacher handbook of policies and procedures. Each small group first prepared a role-playing session about the characteristics of its school/community. This took up the remainder of the second day.

The small group continued the role-playing session on the third day, and performed the roles to the entire group in the latter part of this session. Such role-playing activities sought to expand participants' knowledge about the problems of others including their tasks and difficulties, and were the final aspects of the perceptions' training activity of the workshop.

The fourth and fifth day were devoted to completion of mini-projects by participants as well as preparation of a summary and action plan to the entire group. Blank worksheets for the planning process and implementation phase (see Appendix B) were given to each group to assist in preparation of reports and sharing of ideas. Post-meeting-reaction sheets (See Appendix B) were filled out at the conclusion of the third day (perception training) and at the con-

clusion of the fifth day (small group mini-project work). Also on the fifth day, participants were asked to fill out selection forms for the small group work which would encompass much of the activities for the next two weeks. As with the mini-project selection form, topics chosen by the workshop planning committee were listed for attendees to select from.

At the week's end, a representative from each committee made a report to the entire group. The Dumas Parent Involvement Committee prepared a four step rationale for involving parents in school activities, with specific suggestions for implementing such a program. Part one listed the advantages of parent involvement in school activities; part two developed a plan to enlist parent volunteers, involving a luncheon, publicity, and development of an information file; part three defined specific non-teaching tasks for parents to do in the school and in the classrooms; and the last part discussed the present system of communication between Dumas faculty and parents, and suggested means for improvement. The Dumas committee on the Teacher Resource Center outlined additional materials needed for the center, means for manning the center and a schedule for personnel, as well as a list of professional journals and reference items which were to be included. Also included were the timeline for updating materials and an organizational plan for opening the Resource Center with individuals responsible for specific tasks listed.

The Hyde Park ninth grade Orientation committee came up with a plan that included purposes, suggestions and assignments. The major purpose of an orientation for parents of freshman students would be to acquaint parents and students with procedures and policies of Hyde Park. Suggestions included ways of grouping freshmen, possible times and locations for the orientation, how to publicize it and guarantee attendance, and the need for serving refreshments. Specific assignments to carry out the program were made. The Hyde Park English Curriculum group and the Hyde Park Mathematics Curriculum group both reviewed

what had been accomplished during the past year, and set tasks to be completed. The high school faculty handbook committee and the personal biography committee completed rough drafts of both of these items.

WEEK TWO : July 21-25, 1980

The second week began with the assignment of major small groups from the selection forms. Committees which were formed included a parent involvement committee which focused primarily on the high school; an articulation committee to develop plans for increasing articulation between the high school and feeder schools; a school discipline committee which primarily permitted the newly assigned assistant principal at the high school to vocalize his plans for student discipline for the year with faculty input; a Dumas Career Fairs committee; a Relationships committee, devoted to improving communications among faculty members and between faculty and administration. Monday, Thursday and Friday of the second week were entirely devoted to this small group work, and a status report on each committee's progress was presented to the entire group on Friday. Two days of the week were devoted to the topic of special education, with presentations made by Professor Ken James of Northeastern Illinois University.

Dr. James devoted one session to Pl 94-142, consisting of a status report and implications for the future. The concept and practice of mainstreaming were discussed as it applies to teachers and parents associated with the Chicago Public School system. The next day Professor James illustrated methods of diagnosis and possible prescriptions for the regular teacher confronted with learning problems associated with some of her students. Several case studies were discussed, a number of diagnostic tests were presented, and precautions which teachers must be aware of were revealed. Dr. James' intention was to exhibit how a regular teacher could diagnose learning problems early

and what steps teachers could suggest for offering treatment to such pupils. Following the two days of presentations by Dr. James, workshop participants filled out the third post-meeting-reaction-sheet of the conference.

WEEK THREE : July 25 - August 1, 1980

Much of the final week of the workshop was devoted to completion of small group tasks and preparation of reports. All of Monday, Wednesday and the first part of Friday's session were taken up with completing the small group activity. The concluding portion of Friday's session was set aside for feedback by the small groups to the entire group, with suggestions for implementation of the various plans. Tuesday of the final week provided the opportunities for the Community Council and interns to report on their progress over the past year. The Community Council representatives presented an overview of their activities and accomplishments with members making a brief dramatic presentation. The Council members displayed the variety of their work, first by discussing their backgrounds, their occupations, and the number of different community organizations and activities each was involved in. The Council presentation was concluded by outlining their work over the past year, and plans for the coming year. This included a plea for developing better and more cohesive relationships with the staffs of the schools.

The interns then had their opportunity to discuss the rigorous program they have been involved in, with specific emphasis on their community projects carried out the past year. Intern Janice Hutson discussed the hygiene fair she put together and sponsored in the Dumas School for the upper grades; presenters came to the school and discussed and displayed proper hygiene techniques for the students. Each pupil was also given a small bag of toiletries, collected by Mrs. Hutson from various sources in the local community. Intern Susan

Kaufman explained her project which involved parents of the community in improving basic skills in mathematics and metric education. Ms. Kaufman brought in experts in metric education to assist her, and helped those parents who participated to understand the metric units which now appear with increasing frequency on grocery, drugs and other products. A small metric converter was presented to all who attended. Intern Mark Teachout discussed his project which utilized skills he had developed in a previous job related to career education. Working with staff at the Hyde Park Career Academy, Mr. Teachout developed a file of human resources for career education. The file contained names of potential employers to whom the high school could look for assistance to place students in jobs and provide guidance for future career opportunities. Following the presentations by the Community Council members and interns, workshop participants completed another post-meeting-reaction sheet.

Thursday of the final week was alloted to the topic of teacher stress. Project staff members George Olson and Rick Ginsberg made a presentation in the first part of the day's session. Then they conducted small group stress coping seminars. Dr. Olson and Mr. Ginsberg have an extensive background in studying teacher stress, and at the time were involved in a two year federally funded project looking at working conditions as antecedents of teacher stress. The presentation first described the problem of teacher stress with facts and statistics, and explained the effects that stress can have on a teacher's productivity. Previous studies conducted on Chicago teachers were then reviewed, and the work that the presentors were currently involved in was described. An instrument which had been presented to participants and collected earlier in the workshop, the Teaching Events Stress Inventory (TESI), was discussed, and the results of the group were analyzed. These data were then used as a means of

understanding one possible coping mechanism, the A (awareness) T (tolerance) R (reduction) M (management) Model. Teachers were divided into small groups, and utilizing those events identified in the TESI as most stressful, attempted to use the ATRM coping techniques. Following the stress presentation, a post-meeting-reaction sheet was filled out.

The last part of Friday was devoted to sharing the outcomes of the small group activities. The articulation committee devised a plan for a program for elementary school counselors and upper grade teachers in feeder schools to come to Hyde Park and learn more about its program and facilities. An introductory exercise was planned, topics for discussion outlined, school tour guides designated and a list of printed materials for dissemination settled upon. An organization plan with specific tasks and persons responsible was developed.

The Relationships committee came up with a number of suggestions for the future. Certainly, a school social committee should be inaugurated and the faculty newsletters should be continued. The School Discipline Committee stated that teachers should be responsible for all duties assigned, and administrators should devise a better communications method for informing staffs of forthcoming tasks. Frequent department meetings were suggested as means of explaining the teacher assignment to duty system. The establishment of a human relations committee in each school, involving administration and teachers, was a final recommendation of this group.

The high school discipline committee also produced a list of ideas for enhancing the school's discipline process. The duty roster should be published period by period with a copy provided to each teacher. The office copy would be kept up-to-date. Substitute teachers would be reminded strongly to do the regular teacher's duty and regular teachers would prepare folders for substitutes

including duty lists and all necessary discipline forms. Duty responsibilities must be clear, teachers must cooperate in performing their non-classroom duties. All students and teachers must wear identification badges and rules should be kept to a minimum.

The Dumas Career Fair Committee devised a plan for periodic career fairs to span the next three years. Much advance planning was advised, to involve all teachers and allow for schedule fixing. Means of raising funds, time frames for career speakers, possible topics for presentation and obstacles yet to be overcome were all dealt with in the plan.

The Hyde Park Parent Involvement Group also devised a program for the forthcoming year. A means of bringing parent volunteers into the high school, with specific tasks and faculty support, was the ultimate goal. A letter to parents asking for support was written, to be distributed to division teachers the first day of school. A letter to teachers asking for their support and the types of assistance they deemed appropriate was also written. The school principal, Weldon Beverly, supported the group and signed his name to the letters. A file of potential volunteers would thus be created, listing specific non-teaching tasks for them to perform. A parent volunteer coordinator was selected, who would be present at Hyde Park daily. A future meeting of this group was planned, as well as a presentation to faculty on Teachers' Orientation Day..

Following the presentation of each group's activity to the entire group, a summative evaluation form was filled out by all participants. All participants were then invited to a Community Council sponsored picnic as a culminating social activity.

Evaluation

Post-meeting-reaction sheets were completed by all participants at several points throughout the conference (see Appendix B for samples of PMRS forms). Evaluation forms were filled out on Wednesday of the first week, evaluating human relations consultant John Davis' presentation and the role playing activity; also on Friday of the first week, as a reaction to the mini-project small group work and general reactions to the workshop at this point; on Wednesday of the second week, in response to the special education presentations by consultant Ken James; on Tuesday of the final week, evaluating the small group work up to this point, as well as the Community Council's and interns' presentations. On the last day of the workshop, each participant engaged in a summative evaluation of the entire workshop's activities, including the previous day's stress seminar. As a result of this evaluation process, conclusions can be drawn concerning the value of each of the workshop's activities and presentations, and implications for future workshops can be drawn in terms of the overall value of the workshop and of each content area.

Each activity and presentation was rated in terms of its interest level, usefulness, and appropriateness, utilizing a Lickert scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating and 5 the highest. Evaluations were filled out by four groups, the Hyde Park faculty (N=23), Dumas faculty (N=12), Community Council (N=4) and others/interns (N=3). The overall mean rating of the workshop, as indicated on the final day's summative evaluation form, was 4.27, which connotes a high level of satisfaction by participants with the summer workshop.

The following analysis will present the findings from the periodic evaluations made throughout the workshop, compare these data to those evaluations of each activity and presentation made on the final day's summative evaluation form, compare the periodic reported information with comments on the summative

evaluation as to most valuable and least valuable activities, and draw some conclusions and implication from these data.

TABLE I - MEAN EVALUATIONS - WEDNESDAY OF WEEK I

Group	John Davis' Presentation			Role Playing Construction			Role Playing Presentation			
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	D
Hyde Park Faculty	4.34	3.69	4.43	4.74	4.43	4.78	4.83	4.52	4.65	4.57
Dumas Faculty	4.57	4.29	4.29	4.5	4.38	4.5	5.0	4.37	4.63	4.5
Community Council	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.75	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Others/ Interns	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
All Participants	4.6	4.37	4.55	4.69	4.7	4.76	4.83	4.5	4.7	4.64

Scale 1(low) to 5 (high)

A = Interest Level

B = Usefulness

C = Appropriateness

D = Quality of Presentation/Discussion

Table I displays the responses to the first evaluation, of John Davis' presentation and the role-playing constructions and presentation. Most mean responses for the participating groups ranged between 4.0 and 5.0, with the lowest mean rating a 3.69 by the Hyde Park faculty for Mr. Davis' presentation, and a number of 5.0 ratings by several of the groups. This indicates an over-

all favorable reaction to the activities of the first three days of the conference. John Davis received consistently high ratings for his presentation, with the Hyde Park faculty giving him the lowest scores and the Community Council the highest. Similarly, the role-playing construction received consistently high scores, with the Dumas faculty giving this the lowest ratings, the Community Council the highest. The role-playing presentations also received high scores, with the interns giving it the lowest ratings, the Community Council again the highest. The clearest conclusion is that the conference as a whole was being well-received to this point, with Community Council members grading presentations the highest.

TABLE II - MEAN EVALUATIONS - FRIDAY - WEEK I

Group	Work in Small Groups -Thursday			Work in Small Groups -Friday			Week I Overall			
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	D
Hyde Park Faculty	4.45	4.55	4.8	4.62	4.95	4.95	4.43	4.52	4.48	4.38
Dumas Faculty	4.73	4.73	4.99	4.72	5.0	5.0	4.55	4.63	4.63	4.55
Community Council	5.0	4.99	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Others/ Interns	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
All Participants	4.67	4.82	4.82	4.6	4.99	4.99	4.74	4.66	4.65	4.61

Scale: 1 (low) to 5 (high)

A = Interest Level
B = Usefulness
C = Appropriateness
D = Quality of Presentation/ Discussion

Table II reports the evaluations presented on Friday of week I, following two days of small group mini-project activities. Participants were able to react to the mini-project work, as well as rate the entire first week of the workshop. Ratings on this second evaluation were extremely high, ranging from a low of 4.38 as the mean of one group's responses to several groups collectively responding at the 5.0 level. The Community Council rated the small group work on Thursday, Friday and the entire week the highest, while the Hyde Park faculty rated each of these the lowest. It must be emphasized again, however, that all activities were rated quite high, as the responses by the lowest rating group were not markedly lower than the highest responses. An overwhelming, acceptance of workshop activities to this point is thus indicated.

The third conference evaluation (see Table III next page) was an opportunity to react to the two days of presentations by special education consultant Ken James. A wider level of discrepancy between responses of the groups appears here, although the overall reactions to Dr. James' sessions were quite respectable means ranging between 4.02 and 4.47. This does indicate a high level of praise for the presentations, though this is somewhat lower then previous overall evaluations by the group. The highest ratings for Dr. James' presentation came from the Dumas faculty. This probably is a reflection of the fact that much of what was presented was directly relevant to elementary level teachers.

TABLE III - MEAN EVALUATIONS - WEDNESDAY - WEEK II
PRESENTATIONS BY KEN JAMES

Group	Mainstreaming, PL 94-142 and Adolescent Behavior			Case Study Analysis: Diagnosis and Perception		
	A	B	C	A	B	C
Hyde Park Faculty	4.27	4.09	3.91	4.28	3.7	3.83
Dumas Faculty	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.75
Community Council	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.3	3.7	4.3
Others/ Interns	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5	5.0
All Participants	4.47	4.33	4.26	4.41	4.02	4.2

Scale 1 (low) to 5 (high)

A = Interest Level

B = Usefulness

C = Appropriateness

The lowest ratings came from the Hyde Park faculty, which again may reflect that much of what was presented was not directly appropriate to their daily activities. For the first time in the evaluations, the Community Council did not indicate overwhelming approval, which either may indicate some disinterest with these presentations, or lack of relevancy of this topic as compared to earlier activities. Although the causes of this lower rating are not completely clear, it is significant that even though these mean scores were lower than reported for other aspects of the workshop, the overall ranking was still quite high.

TABLE IV - MEAN EVALUTIONS - TUESDAY - WEEK III

Group	Work in Small Groups			Community Council's Presentation				Interns' Presentation			
	A	B	C	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
Hyde Park Faculty	4.0	3.85	4.19	4.05	3.95	3.8	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.35	4.6
Dumas Faculty	3.22	3.22	3.22	4.0	4.11	4.11	3.88	4.55	4.55	4.55	4.55
Community Council	4.0	4.33	4.33	4.83	5.0	5.0	4.83	4.66	4.5	4.5	5.0
Others/ Interns	4.5	4.2	4.0	4.33	4.33	4.66	4.66	-	-	-	-
All Participants	3.93	3.9	3.93	4.42	4.38	4.66	4.29	4.5	4.31	4.46	4.67

Scale 1 (low) to 5 (high)

A = Interest Level

B = Usefulness

C = Appropriateness

D = Quality of Presentation/Discussion

The fourth evaluation also taking place before the close of the workshop, as reported in Table IV, gave workshop attendees the opportunity to evaluate small group work on Thursday, Friday of week II and Monday of week III, as well as the Community Council's and interns' presentations on Tuesday of the second week. The overall mean results of this evaluation, while still relatively high on a 1 - 5 Lickert scale, indicated some of the lowest scores of the workshop.

The three days of small group work received the lowest rating of any activity, with an overall mean score of 3.93 for interest level, 3.90 for usefulness and 3.93 for appropriateness. Again, these results, while lower than most activities, still indicate positive approval for the sessions. The Dumas faculty scored this activity especially low (3.22) and their scores were the primary reason for the low overall reactions. Some inquiry about the small group work of Dumas faculty indicates that they were primarily in one group, which rather quickly dispensed with its task. The low rating, then, may not display complete workshop disapproval of small group work, but merely poor choice of certain topic selections. Table IV also shows somewhat higher reactions to the Community Council and intern presentations than to the small group activity, with the Hyde Park faculty reporting the lowest scores on both presentations. Overall, the interns' presentation and that of the Community Council, however, were quite positive.

On the last day of the workshop a summative evaluation form was completed. Each participant again reacted to all of the various activities including the previous day's teacher stress seminar. The form requested each participant to describe the most valuable and least valuable activities, discuss conference strengths and weaknesses, and rate the entire workshop. The summative evaluation did not break respondents down by specific group, so total conference participant reactions only can be reported.

Summative Evaluation

The summative evaluation filled out by each participant in the workshop on the final day served several purposes: (1) it gave all who attended the workshop a second opportunity to evaluate every presentation and activity; only the teacher stress seminar held on Thursday of the final week was eval-

uated for the first time on this summative evaluation form; (2) conference attendees also were asked to rate the least and most valuable activities during the workshop; (3) in addition, several items were to be rated for strengths and weaknesses of the workshop; (4) finally, participants were asked to give an overall rating to the workshop using the same 1 to 5 Likert scale. Table V (see next page) presents the summative evaluation of all activities of the conference. The stress seminar, previously unevaluated, received the lowest overall marks by attendees. Its 4.11 mean rating for interest level, while still a high grade, was the lowest for any activity or presentation. The 3.1 mean rating for usefulness was the lowest mean score reported for any item, and indicates only moderate acceptance of the seminar's usefulness. The 4.92 mean rating for appropriateness was a comparatively higher evaluation, and suggests support for the importance of the topic. The fact that the various group's evaluations are not delineated, curtails any detailed discussion of the evaluation, as a group like the Community Council, which had no specific interest or relation to tis presentation, may have scored it low and skewed the total evaluation.

The mini-project small group work of the first week received the highest evaluation in each category. John Davis' perceptions' activity and the role playing work received the second highest scores. The stress seminar was scored the lowest in terms of interest level and usefulness, while Dr. James' presentation's were identified as the least appropriate. The overall mean average of interest level of 4.44, usefulness of 4.09 and appropriateness of 4.33, do, however, indicate a high level of support for workshop activities.

Table VI reports the summative evaluation of workshop strengths and weakness identified by participants. As is evident, many more strengths were *reported than weaknesses.* Relevance of content received the greatest number

TABLE V - MEAN SUMMATIVE EVALUATION REACTIONS TO VARIOUS ACTIVITIES

	A	B	C
Perception Exercises Interviews and Role Play	4.69	4.5	4.52
Mini-Project Small Group Work	4.85	4.54	4.63
Major Small Group Activity	4.47	4.42	4.52
Mainstreaming and Diagnosis and Perception	4.3	3.88	3.94
Community Council Presentation	4.19	3.94	4.08
Interns' Presentation	4.48	4.28	4.34
Stress Seminar	4.11	3.1	4.29
Total Mean Score	4.44	4.09	4.33

Overall Conference Rating: 4.27

Scale 1 (low) to 5 (high)

A = Interest Level

B = Usefulness

C = Appropriateness

TABLE VI - SUMMATIVE EVALUATION
WORKSHOP STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

	Strength*	Weakness*
1. Relevance of Content	29	2
2. Interest of Sessions	26	2
3. Applicability	25	3
4. Interaction with Other Participants	25	6
5. Facilities and Amenities	25	0

*Total number of responses to each category are listed.

of responses as a strength, with interest of sessions rated second, followed very closely by applicability, interaction with other participants and facilities and amenities. Interaction with other participants received the greatest number of responses as a weakness, through the total number of attendees reporting this as a weakness was less then one fourth the number of those who saw it as a strength.

Table VII (see next page) shows the number of responses to activities of presentations in terms of being the most or least valuable activity. Some of these results were somewhat surprising. The major small group activity of the last two weeks received the greatest support as the most valuable activity,

TABLE VII - SUMMATIVE EVALUATION
MOST/LEAST VALUABLE ACTIVITY

Activity	Most Valuable	Least Valuable
Mainstreaming and Diagnosis and Perception	5	11
Stress Seminar	4	2
Mini-Project Small Group Work	3	0
Major Small Group Activity	20	3
Perceptions Training	5	0
Community Council Presentation	0	7
Interns' Presentation	0	2
Other	3	1

by a wide majority (20). Yet, its ratings on Table V, while high, were clearly not the highest overall, but were actually quite close to the overall mean scores. The activity with the highest evaluations on Table V received only 3 responses as the most valuable session. This indicates that while the mini-project activity was not seen as the most valuable section of the conference, its general value was quite positive. Apparently, the overwhelmingly high mean support which the major small group work received was offset somewhat by

some very poor individual evaluations.

In addition, several participants (4) viewed the stress workshop as the most valuable activity, while only two saw it as the least valuable. Again, this was the activity that in Table V had received the overall poorest ratings. Dr. James' special education presentations were marked as the least valuable function of the conference by the largest number, followed by the Community Council's presentation. This does suggest that those activities which have more general appeal, such as small group work, were more positively viewed by the entire group, as opposed to presentations whose audience in terms of specific interest in the information, might have been somewhat less.

Finally, Table VIII (see next page) compares the daily evaluations during the workshop with the summative evaluation on the last day, for the various activities and presentations. The small group mini-project work received the highest mean scores on both sets of evaluations. The perception exercises of John Davis and the role playing sessions received the second highest overall mean scores on both evaluations. The major small group work, which received comparatively low scores on the early evaluation, received much higher scores on the summative form. This may be attributed to the fact that the daily reaction came after only several days of small group work, while the final evaluation considered all of the small group activity. Indeed, it was this small group activity which received the greatest number of responses as being the most valuable activity of the workshop. The ratings of Dr. James' special education presentation, the Community Council's and interns' presenation were all somewhat higher on the daily evaluations than on the summative rating. This indicates that in comparison to other presentations evaluations were lessened. The stress seminar was only evaluated once, and therefore no comparisons can be made.

TABLE VIII - COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS ON PERIODIC POST-MEETING REACTION SHEETS WITH THOSE ON THE SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

Activity	Mean Ratings On Post-Meeting Reaction Sheets			Mean Ratings On Summative Evaluations		
	A	B	C	A	B	C
Perception Exercises Role Playing Sesssions	4.68	4.52	4.67	4.69	4.5	4.52
Mini-Project Small Group Work	4.64	4.91	4.91	4.85	4.54	4.63
Major Small Group Work	3.93	3.9	3.93	4.47	4.42	4.52
Mainstreaming and Diagnosis and Prescription	4.44	4.18	4.23	4.30	3.88	3.94
Community Council Presentation	4.42	4.38	4.66	4.19	3.94	4.08
Interns' Presentation	4.5	4.31	4.46	4.48	4.28	4.34

Scale 1 (low) to 5 (high)

A = Interest Level

B = Usefulness

C = Appropriateness

Conclusions

The Summer 1980 workshop was the second of three planned summer workshops for the Program '78 Roosevelt University Teacher Corps Project. Building on the success of workshops conducted for a Cycle 11 Project, and the experiences of the 1979 Summer Workshop, the 1980 workshop successfully met the goals set

for itself, a collaborative effort to meet, identify and solve school related problems, as well as planning activities for the 1980-1981 academic year. In addition, the Summer 1980 workshop assimilated certain areas for discussion and analysis, as outlined by the Cadres and planning committee. Thus, consultants made presentations on perceptions and human relationships, special education and teacher stress. As described, the overall workshop evaluation was quite high (4.27), indicating positive support for all activities and presentations.

Based on workshop evaluations, however, several recommendations for future Summer workshops are suggested. The mini-small group work was most commonly marked as the most valuable activity. It can be concluded that small group, task oriented approaches are the most desirable in terms of participant reactions. This type of activity permits individuals to concentrate on specific areas of concern, and also allows certain groups to form plans for the coming year.

In addition, consultant John Davis' perceptions seminar, designed to get individuals to better appreciate others, also received high ratings. This fact, added to the evaluation data indicates that interaction with others was seen as a weakness of this conference and indicates that more activities for participant intermingling would be desirable. Many of the groups connected with the Project only rarely interact during the academic year and the summer workshop is an ideal time and place for all to get to know one another, rekindle old friendships, and share ideas and activities which have been going on throughout the Project's existence. The resulting closer-knit Project participation of the various groups strengthens the Project, and assists it to obtain its goals.

Epilog

The Director arranged to have reproduced copies of each committee's report as soon as possible following the close of the workshop and had them mailed to the participants and to both Principals. Shortly thereafter sufficient copies were reproduced of significant reports to distribute them to each faculty member of both schools on Teachers' Orientation Day occurring on Tuesday following the Labor Day holiday.

He also arranged to have personal meetings with the two Principals before the start of the 1980-81 term in order to be sure that they had full understanding of the importance of the recommendations made in the various reports.

The personal biographies booklet and the revision of the Teacher's Handbook of Policies and Procedures of interest to members of the Hyde Park faculty were also reproduced and bound in sufficient numbers so as to give each faculty member one copy of each. They were ready for distribution also on Teachers' Orientation Day.

On Orientation Day early in the morning's deliberations, the Principal of each school permitted the Director and Assistant Director of the Project to address the entire faculties about the accomplishments of the Project during the summer workshop and the significance of the reports and special booklets distributed to faculty members.

The orientation programs for parents of freshmen took place on the last three days of the first week of school and were deemed quite successful by the members of the Committee who had produced the report. Not only did committee members participate in this program, but also the interns and the Community Council's Parent Volunteer Coordinator.

Both the administration and faculties of both schools reacted most favorable to both the reports and special booklets.

Calendar of Events

SUMMER WORKSHOP - 1980
July 14 - August 1

7/14	7/15	7/16	7/17	7/18
Overview 1) Goals of Teacher Corps, Procedures, & Staff Introduction (C. Melnick) 2) Perspectives: (Dean Schwartz) 3) Perceptions: (John Davis)	**Perceptions** 1) Large Group Orientation: A) Group Assignment. B) Procedures and Purposes. 2) Small Group Work: A) Role Play About Your School. B) Discussion of Role Plays.	**Perceptions** 1) Small Group Work. How do your perceive other teachers, and how do they perceive you? 2) Large Group: Feedback, Identification of Issues, Discussion Towards Resolution. (PMRS)	**Mini-Projects** 1) Small Group Work: A) Work Towards Completion of Tasks Already Begun. B) New Work On Old Ideas. C) Finishing Unfinished Business.	**Mini-Projects** 1) Small Group Work: A) Projects Completed. B) Plans For Completion Large Group: 2) Feedback From Small Group (PMRS)
7/21 **Major Small Group Topics** 1) Formulation of Small Groups A) Brief Orientation B) Establishing Procedures and Expectations. 2) Commencement of Work On Chosen Topic.	**7/22** **Mainstreaming** 1) Large Group: A) Overview and Update: What is the present status of PL 94-142? B) Application to the Home Front: What are the implications for us? 2) Guidance for the Future: What should we be doing, what can we strive for?	**7/23** **Diagnosis and Prescription** 1) How does the Regular Teacher Diagnose Special Learning Problems Early? 2) What are Reasonable Second and Third Steps for Seeking of Offering Treatment? (PMRS)	**7/24** **Major Small Group Topics** 1) Review Objectives and Procedures. 2) Begin Plan for Coming Year. 3) Decide on Planning and Reporting Format.	**7/25** **Major Small Group Topics** 1) Midway Mark In Small Group Work: Develop Full Plan. 2) Commit Plan To Writing and Deliver. 3) Prepare Feedback Report For Large Group.
7/28 **Major Small Group Topics** 1) Revise Plan If Needed. 2) Develop Implementation Strategy: General. (PMRS)	**7/29** **Community Council and T.C. Interns** 1) Activities and Accomplishments of the Community Council. 2) Interns' Projects in Community Based Education. (PMRS)	**7/30** **Major Small Group Topics** 1) Completion of Strategy for Implementation. 2) Commit Strategy to Writing. 3) Review and Revision of Plan and Strategy.	**7/31** **Mini Workshop: Stress in Schooling** 1) Large Group: Definitions, Sources, and Potential Resolution Strategies. 2) Small Group: Identifying Stressful Events and Probable Causes. 3) Feedback From Small Groups: Next Steps.	**8/1** **Culmination:** 1) Submission of Small Group Reports: Time for Final Touches. 2) 3 Weeks in Review: Feedback From Small Groups. 3) Procedures for Implementation: General Approaches. 4) Summative Evaluation. PICNIC!

Teacher Corps Project
Roosevelt University

Summer Workshop, July, 1980

July 14, 1980

Welcome to the second Summer Workshop of the Roosevelt University Project 78 Teacher Corps Project. The next three weeks should provide all participants with a chance to obtain some new ideas, to work on feasible solutions to significant school problems, to meet new people within the school community and to work with them on common concerns. Over the past few months the format and content of the workshop has been formulated. Of particular importance have been the contributions of the faculty of Hyde Park Career Academy and Dumas Elementary School who have served on the Summer Workshop Planning Committee:

From Dumas: Arlene Alexander
Charles Carroll
Margaret Gray

From Hyde Park: Lucille Hale
Jay Mulberry
Elenor Peterson
Florence Schwartz
William Wagner

These persons contributed their time outside of school hours and represented the interests of their respective constituents admirably.

Following is a general description of the goals, methods and intended outcomes of the workshop.

I. Goals

Generally stated, the goals for this workshop are:

A) To provide an opportunity for interested faculty, administrators, community members and interns of the involved schools to meet and work together on the identification of school related problems and the design of strategies to solve them.

B) To produce plans of action and strategies for implementing the plans which will guide the collaborative efforts of Teacher Corps staff and school and community persons in satisfaction of the overall goals of the Teacher Corps project.

Building upon what has been learned in the past year, stronger and more lasting efforts to implement the plans will be put forth both in seeking assistance and involvement from a wider range of faculty and parents and in enlisting the support and assistance of the administrations of the involved schools. Additionally, through large group activities, we all hope to increase our knowledge in areas of general interest, namely in broadening our understanding of the nature of education in levels other than our own, in improving our abilities to respond appropriately to the exceptional child and student, in increasing our knowledge of how to work collaboratively with parents, and in how to begin to cope with stress in our jobs.

II. Methods

A combination of large and small group sessions will be used with small group work being the dominant format. Specific procedures and products will be required from the small groups. Large group sessions will have greater variability in their structure, format and intended outcomes. Facilitators will be assigned to small groups to assist, but not interfere; to prod, but not command. Participants' reactions to the activities will be assessed for the primary purpose of indicating general satisfaction level and secondarily for making any needed modifications in format or content.

III. Outcomes

In terms of products, it is the intention of the workshop to produce feasible plans of action in a variety of different areas that will be implemented in the coming year. The areas addressed will deal with concerns of the involved school personnel, but will be areas directly and indirectly related to the goals of Teacher Corps. These plans will be blueprints for action in the fall and throughout the coming school year.

In terms of process, it is intended that there be an increased desire and ability among school and community personnel to work collaboratively on problems of mutual and individual interest. Strategies, methods, and procedures that are used are intended to be models for further group work.

On an individual or personal level, it is hoped that participants enjoy themselves, both in the sociability that will be afforded and in the sense of accomplishment that is the product of hard work and completion of a worthwhile task. It is hoped that personal satisfaction will help to launch and sustain efforts in the coming year.

Roosevelt University
College of Education

Summer Workshop, 1980

August 1, 1980

Post Workshop Reactions

I. Please rate the following by assigning numbers 1-5 in the appropriate spaces. Number 1 indicates the lowest rating, and number 5 the highest rating.

Perceptions Exercises (Mon.-Wed., 1st Week) Interviews and Role Play. (John Davis)

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness
_____	_____	_____

Comments: _____

Mini-Projects (Thurs, and Frid., 1st Week) Small Group Work

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness
_____	_____	_____

Comments: _____

Major Small Group Topics (Five and one half days in small group spread over last 2 weeks).

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness
_____	_____	_____

Comments: _____

Mainstreaming and Diagnosis and Prescription (Tues. and Wed. of 2nd week) by Ken James.

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness
_____	_____	_____

Comments: _____

Community Council Presentation (Community Council Member)

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness
_____	_____	_____

Comments: _____

Interns Presentation (Teacher Corps Interns)

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness
_____	_____	_____

Comments: _____

STRESS Workshop (Rick Ginsberg and George Olson)

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness
_____	_____	_____

Comments: _____

II. Please describe the most valuable activity and least valuable activity of the conference for you:

A) Most Valuable: _____

_____

_____

_____

B) Least Valuable: _____

_____

_____

_____

III. Check any of the following which you consider to have been strengths or weaknesses of the conference:

	Strength	Weakness
1) Relevance of content	_____	_____
2) Interest of sessions	_____	_____
3) Applicability	_____	_____
4) Interaction with other participants	_____	_____
5) Facilities and amenities		
_____	_____	_____

IV. Please rate the conference overall by circling the appropriate number:

1	2	3	4	5
very poor	poor	satisfactory	good	very good

Teacher Corps Project
Roosevelt University

SUMMER WORKSHOP 1980

Post Meeting Reaction Sheet

Please check or write in your role below:

Hyde Park Faculty _____ Dumas Faculty _____ Community member _____ Other _____

I. Please rate the following sessions by assigning numbers 1-5* in the appropriate spaces. Number 1 is lowest and number 5 is the highest.

A. Interviewing Activity - John Davis (Monday)

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness
_____	_____	_____

Comments:

B. Role Play Construction Activity (Tuesday)

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness
_____	_____	_____

Comments:

C. Role Play Presentations (Wednesday)

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness	Quality of Presentation and/or Discussion
_____	_____	_____	_____

Comments:

II. Suggestions or General Comments:

Teacher Corps Project
Roosevelt University

SUMMER WORKSHOP 1980

Post Meeting Reaction Sheet

Please check or write in your role below:

Hyde Park Faculty _____ Dumas Faculty _____ Community member _____ Other _____

I. Please rate the following sessions by assigning numbers 1-5* in the appropriate spaces. Number 1 is lowest and number 5 is highest.

A. Work in Small Groups: Thursday

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness
_____	_____	_____

Comments:

B. Work in Small Groups: Friday

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness
_____	_____	_____

Comments:

C. The first week overall.

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness	Quality of Presentation and/or Discussion
_____	_____	_____	_____

Comments:

II. Suggestions or General Comments:

Teacher Corps Project
Roosevelt University

Summer Workshop, 1980

Post Meeting Reaction Sheet

Please check or write in your role below:

Hyde Park Faculty _____ Dumas Faculty _____ Community member _____ Other _____

I. Please rate the following sessions by assigning numbers 1-5* in the appropriate spaces. Number 1 is lowest and number 5 is highest.

A. Work in Small Groups: Thursday, Friday and Monday

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness
_____	_____	_____

Comments:

B. Community Council Presentation

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness	Quality of Presentation and/or Discussion
_____	_____	_____	_____

Comments:

C. Interns' Presentation

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness	Quality of Presentation and/or Discussion
_____	_____	_____	_____

Comments:

II. Suggestions or General Comments:

Teacher Corps Project
Roosevelt University

Summer Workshop 1980

Post Meeting Reaction Sheet

July 23, 1980

Please check or write in your role below:

Hyde Park Faculty _____ Dumas Faculty _____ Community member _____ Other _____

I. Please rate the following sessions by assigning numbers 1-5* in the appropriate spaces. Number 1 is lowest and number 5 is highest.

A. Presentation by Ken James on Mainstreaming, PL 94-142, and Adolescent Behavior. (Tuesday)

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness
_____	_____	_____

Comments:

B. Case Study Analysis: Diagnosis and Prescription by Ken James. (Wednesday)

Interest Level	Usefulness	Appropriateness
_____	_____	_____

Comments:

II. Suggestions or General Comments:

PROJECT WORK SHEET: Implementation

Resources Needed (human and materials)	What presently exists that will have to be modified?	Forces in the system: Negative / Positive	Sequenced strategy for promotion and implementation

16

17

PROJECT WORK SHEET: Planning

Objectives (Specific)	Activity(s) that will Satisfy Objectives	Method of Evaluation	Completion Date	Personnel needed and their role